REMARKS

Claim 5 is cancelled. Claims 13, 15-21 28 and 30-48 were previously cancelled. Claims 1, 2, 4 and 6 have been amended. Claim 1 is amended to include recitations found in claim 5. Claim 2 is amended to provide proper antecedent basis. Claim 4 is amended to clarify that the liquid sample has one volume. Claim 6 is amended to depend from claim 1 instead of canceled claim 5.

It is respectfully submitted that the present amendment presents no new issues or new matter and places this case in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is requested.

I. The Rejection of Claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. 112

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, as lacking antecedent basis for the phrase "test compound." Claim 2 has been amended to recite only the term "compound," which has proper antecedent basis in claim 1.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the claims overcome this rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

II. The Rejection of Claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. 112

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, as indefinite for the recitation that the liquid sample has "a volume selected from 5-95% of the volume of 3.7 ml, etc." is unclear because there is only one volume for a sample. The second recited volume, as explained in the specification on page 5, lines 27-30, refers to the volume of liquid held by a micro plate well. Thus, the claim recites that the volume of the liquid sample is 5 to 95% of the volume held by the well, i.e., 5 to 95% of 3.7 ml, 320 µl, 160 µl, or 14 µl. Claim 5, however, been amended to clarify that only one volume is at issue for a specific sample, and thus, it now simply recites that the sample has a volume selected from 5 to 95% of 3.7 ml, 320 µl, 160 µl, and 14 µl, respectively.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the claims overcome this rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

III. The Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 3, 5, 22, 23, 24, 25 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1, 2, 3, 5, 22, 23, 24, 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as anticipated by Su et al.

Su et al. is directed to a method for cleaning contact lenses, which the Offices states are

PAGE 8/10 * RCVD AT 12/21/2004 11:41:23 AM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/2 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:2128400221 * DURATION (mm-ss):02-44

rubber or plastic materials. Although Su et al. does not teach the claimed method, there is also no teaching in Su et al. to clean surfaces other than contact lenses. In order to expedite prosecution, the claims are amended to recite that the surface is an inorganic surface selected from metal, glass, ceramic, enamel concrete, rock, marble, gypsum and composite combinations thereof or an organic surface selected from wood, paper, leather, fur, paint and fabric. Such surfaces are not disclosed in Su et al.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the claims overcome this rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

IV. The Rejection of Claims 1, 5-12, 14, 22-26 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1, 6-12, 14, 22-26 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over Luechauer. The Office states that Luechauer teach a test card for testing cleaning processes to determine whether a cleaning solution had an effective stain removal. The Office states that Luechauer teaches that a test card comprises a number of detectors formed on dyed textile material (tracers) with dyes, which by their color changes, indicate the relative intensity of the factors of concentration of the chemicals and the time and temperature employed in various steps. The Offices states that Leuchauer teaches applying a mechanical stress, i.e., the normal laundering process. The Office states that Leuchauer does not teach using smaller sample volumes, however, the Office alleges that it would be obvious to do so to conserve sample.

This rejection is respectfully traversed. Leuchauer does not suggest a method for evaluating the cleaning effect of a compound on a stained surface in relation to mechanical stress in a small volume sample. Leuchauer is directed to the determining the physio-chemical and chemical parameters which control the laundering process and is based on an observable color change. See Leuchauer at col. 1, lines 9-11 and lines 49-62. In this regard, even assuming one were motivated to reduce the volume (which motivation is not found in the cited reference), there is no teaching or suggestion in Leuchuaer as to (1) the importance of mechanical stress or (2) how a skilled artisan would be able to reproduce mechanical stress at the micro level. Thus, Leuchauer does not render the claimed invention obvious as although there is no motivation in Leuchauer to reduce the volume tested, Leuchauer also does not motivate an artisan to reproduce mechanical stress at the micro level and Leuchauer also does not teach how to assess the cleaning effect of a compound in relation to the mechanical stress at a micro level.

PAGE 9/10 * RCVD AT 12/21/2004 11:41:23 AM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/2 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:2128400221 * DURATION (mm-ss):02-44

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the claims overcome this rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

V. The Rejection of Claims 27 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 27 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as obvious over Su et al. in view of Nicolson et al.

Su et al. is directed to a method for cleaning contact lenses, which the Offices states are rubber or plastic materials. Although Su et al. does not teach the claimed method, there is also no teaching in Su et al. to clean surfaces other than contact lenses. In order to expedite prosecution, the claims are amended to recite that the surface is an inorganic surface selected from metal, glass, ceramic, enamel concrete, rock, marble, gypsum and composite combinations thereof or an organic surface selected from wood, paper, leather, fur, paint and fabric. Such surfaces are not disclosed in Su et al. Nicolson et al. is not cited for motivating an artisan to apply the Su et al. contact lense cleaning system to other surfaces, and thus, the combination of Su et al. and Nicolson et al. do not suggest the claimed invention.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the claims overcome this rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all claims are in condition for allowance. Early action to that end is respectfully requested. The Examiner is hereby invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if there are any questions concerning this amendment or application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 21, 2004

Jason I. Garbell, Reg. No. 44,116
Novozymes North America, Inc.
500 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1600
New York, NY 10110
(212)840-0097

PAGE 10/10 * RCVD AT 12/21/2004 11:41:23 AM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/2 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:2128400221 * DURATION (mm-ss):02-44